

D I P P I N G  
K  
Not the only  
Scriptural and Primitive MANNER

O F

B A P T I Z I N G.

And supposing it were, yet a strict Adherence  
to it not obligatory on us.

---

In CHRIST JESUS, neither Circumcision availeth any Thing, nor Uncircumcision, but a new Creature. Galat. vi. 15.

---



---

L O N D O N:

Printed and Sold by J. Wauoh, at the Turk's Head in  
Lombard-Street. M'DCC LI.



# P R E F A C E.

**T**H E Subject of the ensuing Treatise is, in it self, of so little Moment, that it may seem needful to apologize for offering it to public View. But no one knows any Thing of the History of RELIGION, that hath not seen, with Astonishment, the power of that Name to make little Things become great; to give Trifles a solemn Air; and to exalt Circumstances and Modes into Objects, not of Men's grave Attention only, but, of their warmest Passions and Zeal.

Even under the Christian Dispensation, that rational, sublime and spiritual Scheme of Worship, the Minds of it's Professors have with great violence been agitated, and fierce Controversies have arose upon the most frivolous Points—Whether the Sacramental Supper is to be eaten with leavened, or with unleavened Bread?—Whether Easter is to be kept precisely on the fourteenth Day after the first vernal Moon: Or, not till the Sunday following? — Whether the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father AND the Son: Or, from the Father BY the Son? — Whether the Christian Laity were to cross themselves with two Fingers only: Or, whether, like the Clergy, they might not use three\*?—Furious and dire Controversies

\* The Church, through the vast Empire of Russia, was greatly rent and inflamed, even to Tortures and Death itself, in the reign of CZAR Theodore, by this insignificant Dispute. Vid. Present State of Russia — Vol. I. Page 238. Voltaire says, a violent Sédition was raised by it in Astracan. Life of Charles XII. page 21.

versies, to the terrible Convulsion of Kingdoms and States; and to the infinite Reproach of the Christian Doctrine and Name, have been kindled up in the Church, upon such trifling Debates.

Of much the same Moment is the Point here discussed; viz. whether Baptism is to be administered by Dipping the Body under Water; Or, by Sprinkling or Pouring on.

There are some worthy and good Persons — (extremely strange to consider!) who lay so great Stress upon this trivial Circumstance in Religion, as to allow none to be baptized Christians but those who have been dipt — To break off christian Fellowship, and renounce Communion as Saints, with Men of the most shining Piety, if they have not been thus baptized — And even to think themselves obliged to be unwearied in raising Doubts and Anxieties in the Breasts of Such, concerning the Validity and Truth of their Baptism.

Many pious, but weak Minds have been greatly disturbed, not to say distressed, with Scruples on this Head. When they hear it confidently affirmed — That Baptism evermore, and constantly, implies Dipping — That no Person ever was, or can be, baptized, who has not been dipt — And consequently, that themselves are as really unbaptized, as Pagans or Turks — It fills them with concern. They doubt whether they are not wanting in Obedience to an express Command and Institution of CHRIST.

Effectually to remove every Scruple of this kind, to shew, that there is no Occasion of putting this Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples, and to vindicate CHRISTIANITY from the unworthy Imputation of laying so great a Stress upon so merely circumstantial and external a Thing, is the Design of the ensuing Treatise. How far it shall be effectual to answer this Purpose — is bumbly left to the Favour of Heaven; and to the calm and impartial Judgment of those into whose Hands it may happen to fall.



T H E

# QUESTION.

*Is Christian-Baptism to be administered ONLY by Immersion, or Dipping the Body under Water? or, may it not ALSO, by Sprinkling, or Pouring Water on it?*

THE following Tract is intended to prove,

FIRST, That *Dipping the Body under Water*, was not the *only antient and scriptural way of Baptizing*. And

SECONDLY, That, if it was, yet a strict adherence to it, is not obligatory upon us: but that this *Circumstance* may, very lawfully and properly, be now exchanged for that of *Sprinkling or Pouring*.

2 Dipping, not the only scriptural

SECTION I.

**I**T is, First, to be shewn — That *Dipping the Body under Water*, was not the *only* antient and scriptural way of *Baptizing*. To which purpose, the three following Things are premised ; in which all are agreed.

I. That *Baptism* (i. e. Water-Baptism) is but an *emblematical*, or *figurative* Thing.

II. That the general nature or design of this *Emblem* or *Figure*, is — by the application of Water, to *signify* or *betoken* a Person to be holy or clean ; appropriated to, and fit for the divine Service. And,

III. That *Baptism* was really a *divine Institution* ; and, by the express command of God, practised as a *religious Rite* in his Church ; both long before, and at the time of *John's* and *CHRIST's* appearing, and beginning to baptize.

THIS last Proposition is not, perhaps, so carefully attended to, as it ought. We are wont to consider *Baptism*, as a purely *Christian Institution* ; and to trace it to no higher Origin than *JESUS CHRIST*, or *John the Baptist*. But this is certainly wrong. *Baptism* was, unquestionably, a *divine Institution* ; practised as a *religious and sacred Ceremony*, in the Church of God, Ages before. There were *πιασοποιοι Βαπτισμοι*, diverse kinds of *Baptisms*, the Apostle expressly says\*, in which the *Worship of God stood*, under the *Jewish Dispensation*.

Neither

\* Heb. ix. 10.

and primitive manner of Baptizing. 3

Neither John, nor our Saviour, did properly *institute* this Rite †: but only took this antient, standing, religious *Institution*, and applied it to a particular Purpose, in their Mission: namely, *By the application of Water, to betoken to certain Persons, that they should be accepted of GOD, as holy and pure; fit for his Service, and for a place in that Church, or Kingdom of the MESSIAH, which was then going to be set up* \*.

THEY made no alteration in it's general *Nature or Design*. Baptism, under the New Testament, has the very same general Meaning, Purpose or Intent, with Baptism under the Old: And is but an application of Water to *signify* or *betoken* a person to be holy, or consecrated to the service of GOD. It is a *ceremonial*, and but a ceremonial, *Washing* in both.

Now, forasmuch as neither CHRIST, nor John the Baptist, did properly *institute*, but only *borrowed* or *continued* this before-instituted Ceremony; and forasmuch, as it has the *very same* general meaning and design under the Christian Scheme of Worship, as it had under the Jewish; it follows, that to look back to the MANNER of it's administration under the Old Testament, will be of great use to direct us, as to the MANNER of it's administration under the New.

WHAT, then, was the MANNER, in which Baptism was wont to be administered; that is to say,

B 2

say,

† It is a great Truth (says Grotius) what the most learned Broughton notes, *That Christ instituted no new Rites*. Vid. Tract concerning Communicating, &c.

\* Our Lord took (says Dr. Lightfoot) into his Hands Baptism, such as he found it: adding only this, that he exalted it to a nobler Purpose, and to a larger Use. Hor. Heb. Matt. iii. 6.

4 Dipping, not the only scriptural

say, in which Water was wont to be applied, by God's express Command, to Persons or Things, to betoken them holy, and consecrated to his Service; at that Time, and in that Church, in which both John and JESUS CHRIST were born, and brought up? Was it ONLY by Dipping wholly under Water? Or, was it not ALSO by Sprinkling, or Pouring it on? I reply—Undoubtedly by both.

That it was sometimes by Dipping, there is no dispute. And that it was also, sometimes, by Sprinkling, or Pouring on, the Case is equally clear. Amongst a multitude, I shall mention but the following Texts.

LEVIT. xiv. When a Leper, who had been put out from the Camp of Israel (the then Enclosure, or Church of God) as being unclean or unholy, was again to be taken in, and received to the Communion of Saints, (i. e. of the Israelites, the holy People) and to a free access to God; by what Ceremony was it done? SPRINKLING Water on him, was one of the principal Rites by which he was thus received. Verse 7. And He, the Priest, shall SPRINKLE upon him, that is to be cleansed from the Leprosy, and shall pronounce him clean. By the same Rite also, of SPRINKLING, the infected House was to be purified, i. e. declared holy or clean. Verses 51, 52.

NOTE, It ought carefully to be remembered, that the LAW is expressly said to be a Shadow or Exemplar of the CHRISTIAN Dispensation; and the then Scheme of Worship, was intended to be a sacred Figure or Type of the present \*.

NUMB. viii. When the Levites were to be separated from the rest of the Tribes, and consecrated a holy Priesthood to God (a Figure of Christians,

\* Heb. viii. 5. ix. 9. x. 8. Vid. Peirce in Loc.

and primitive manner of Baptizing. 5

*Christians, who, at their Baptism, are separated from the rest of the World, and are consecrated a holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual Sacrifices †.) How was it done? Verses 6, 7. Take the Levites, from among the Children of Israel, and cleanse them: And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them, SPRINKLE Water of purifying upon them..*

NUMB. xix. 11. If a Man had touched a dead Body, and was thereby become unclean, unfit to approach GOD, and to stand before him in his Sanctuary; by what Rite was he to be declared clean, and readmitted to the divine Presence? The Water of separation was to be SPRINKLED upon him, and upon his Tent, and upon his Vessels.

FINALLY, When the Israelites were called out from among the idolatrous Egyptians; and were sanctified and set apart as a holy People or Church to GOD; they were all baptized, the Apostle says \*, by the Cloud, and by the Sea, εν τη νεφελῃ, καὶ εν τη θαλασσῃ; i. e. by the Cloud pouring down Water on them, and by the Sea Sprinkling them with its Surges, as they passed through. And when they were, in the most solemn manner, entered into covenant with JEHOVAH at Sinai, and formed into a Church; by what Token or Rite did Moses, the Mediator, initiate or admit them? When Moses had spoken every precept to all the People, according to the Law; and they had publickly consented and promised to obey; He took the Blood of sacrificed Beasts, and Water, and SPRINKLED both the Book and all the People ‡.

HENCE, then, it is indisputable; that SPRINKLING, or POURING ON Water, was one of the principal

† 1 Pet. ii. 5.

\* 1 Cor. x. 2. See more concerning this Text, p. 11.

‡ Heb. ix. 19.

6 Dipping, not the only scriptural  
principal Ways in which it was applied, by God's  
express Command, to betoken Persons to be holy :  
Or, that it was a religious Ceremony, by which  
Men were taken from a State of Distance, into a  
State of Nearness or access to Almighty God, in  
the very Church, wherein John and JESUS CHRIST  
were brought up, and from which they bor-  
rowed this religious Rite of BAPTIZING—For it  
is carefully to be observed that this is but a bor-  
rowed Rite.

BUT, perhaps, it will be replied — “ That  
“ none of the Instances, now mentioned, of ap-  
“ phing Water for Purification, were really Bap-  
“ tizing ; for the true and the only Import of that  
“ word is *Plunging* or *Dipping*” — If this, indeed,  
can be proved, all that has been alleged must be  
owned of little Weight. But if the contrary be  
clearly shewn ; if it can be evidently demon-  
strated that the Word *Baptizω*, to baptize, is fre-  
quently (and even generally) used in Scripture,  
where the act of *Pouring* or *Sprinkling*, not *Dip-  
ping*, is intended ; and that the above-mention'd  
applications of Water, under the *Jewish Law*, are  
expressly called BAPTISMS, — the Point will  
be then fully cleared ; and, there remains no far-  
ther room for doubt, as to this matter. But both  
these, I apprehend, are very evidently to be  
shewn — To begin with the latter.

1. The above-mentioned applications of Water,  
under the *Jewish Law*, are, in Scripture, account-  
ed and actually called Baptisms. For, *Heb.* ix. 10.  
it is said the *Jewish Dispensation stood in meats, and  
drinks, and DIVERSE BAPTISMS, θιαγοποιεῖς Βαπτίσμοις.* All, who understand the Original, know,  
that the words do and must mean diverse SORTS of  
Baptisms, or Baptisms of different Species or kinds.

It

and primitive manner of Baptizing. 7

It is not said πολλοις many, nor ποικιλοις various, but διαφοροις diverse, or differing Sorts. The only place, in the new Testament, where the word (διαφορα) is used, besides this, is Rom. xii. 6. Where, by διαφορα χαρισματα differing, or diverse Gifts, is indisputably meant several differing KINDS of Gifts; as the words following demonstrate, viz. Prophecy, Teaching, Ruling, &c. The Word Βαπτισμος Baptisms, in the one Place, like the Word χαρισματα Gifts, in the other, is used as a Genus, or general Term, under which are comprehended several Species or Kinds; and, when here joined with διαφορα diverse, must necessarily signify several different Manners, or Modes, of applying Water, for ceremonial Purification, under the Jewish Law. Some of these were by Dipping, some by Sprinkling or Pouring. Should, then, a Person now say — That there is no Baptism but by Dipping, — he would most plainly and undeniably contradict the Apostle; For he would hereby affirm, that there is but ONE kind of Baptism; whereas the Apostle declares there are MORE kinds than ONE \*.

As, in the forecited Passage, Rom. xii. 6. by calling the several Powers in the Christian Church, viz. Prophecy, Ruling, Teaching, διαφορα χαρισματα differing Gifts, the Apostle does, undoubtedly, pronounce

\* Concerning the Sense of the Word διαφορα diverse, see also Wisdom vii. 10. διαφορας φυτων Diversities, or diverse Sorts, of Plants. Dan. vii. 19. θηριον διαφορον παρα ταν θηριον a Beast of a Kind or Species different from all other Beasts. So the Word διαφορατερα is twice used, in this same Epistle. Heb. i. 4. and viii. 6. in both which Places, it signifies of a very different kind. A Name, of a very different kind: and a Ministry, of a very different kind from their's.

## 8 Dipping, not the only scriptural

pronounce *each* to be a *Gift*; so, by calling the several *Ways* of *Jewish Purification*, viz. *Sprinkling*, *Pouring*, *Dipping*, *Διαχειρος Βαπτισμος* differing *Baptisms*, he does, as certainly and undoubtedly, pronounce *each* to be a *Baptism*. Yea, that the Apostle has, in this Place, a more particular regard to the *Jewish SPRINKLINGS*, than *DIPPINGS*, seems highly probable (to say the least) from his express mention of the *SPRINKLINGS*, Verse 13. as some of the *principal* of those legal Purifications, or *differing Baptisms*, concerning which he had spoken. Verse 10. *For if the Blood of Bulls and of Goats, and the ashes of a Heifer, (with which the Water of Purification was made) SPRINKLING the unclean, sanctifieth to the Purifying of the Flesh; How much more, &c.*

If any shall imagin that the *Baptizing of Cups, Pots, Tables, human Bodies, &c.* is meant by these *diverse Baptisms*: The Reply is obvious. These, if they must be all *Dipt*, in order to their being *baptized*, can with no Truth or Propriety be called *diverse* or *differing kinds* of *Baptisms*; for they are then but *one* and *the same* *Baptism of differing Things*.

HERE, then, is full Proof that the Scripture uses the word *Βαπτισμος*, *Baptism*, in so general and large a Sense, as evidently to comprehend *Sprinkling*, if not *chiefly* to intend it. *Sprinkling* then, in the Judgment of an *inspired writer*, is an authentic and divinely instituted manner of *Baptizing*. I proceed,

2. To shew, that the word *Βαπτιζω*, *to baptize*, is frequently used, in Scripture, where the act of *Pouring* or *Sprinkling*, not *Dipping*, is intended: And, that a Person is said *to be baptized*, when not his whole

and primitive manner of Baptizing. 9

whole Body was plunged under Water, but when Water was applied only to a Part.

LUKE xi. 38. The Pbarisee, who invited our Lord to dine with him, marvelled that he had not first been BAPTIZED before Dinner, οτι ου πρωτον εβαπτισθη. Did he expect that our Lord should have plunged his whole Body under Water before Dinner? Undoubtedly not. But what his expectations were, may be learnt from those of his Brother-Pbarisees, in the very same Case, as to the Disciples; They found Fault with them for eating with defiled, that is to say, with UNWASHEN HANDS \*. + So Grotius explains it — Εβαπτισθη baptism; that is, says he, ενθαλα τας χειρας, had not first washed his Hands. And “ Dr. Pocock observes, and quotes Beza as saying, that Βαπτιζεσθαι, to be baptized (Luke xi. 38.) means the same as λουσθαι and χειρουντειν to wash, and to wash the Hands. “ And since that washing the Hands might be done, either by putting them into the Water, or by pouring Water on them; here is a Word used, εβαπτισθη, which comprehends both the one and the other of these Ways †”.

MARK vii. 3, 4. The Pbarisees, and all the Jews, when they come from the Market, εν μη εβαπτισθαι except they are BAPTIZED, eat not. Did they think themselves obliged, on every such Occasion, to be DIPT wholly under Water? Absurd to imagine! For it is said, not only the Pbarisees, but

C

ALL

\* Mark vii. 2.

+ Note, Aaron and his Sons, even when they went into the Tabernacle, and officiated in the most solemn manner, to offer up the Burnt-offering upon the altar unto God; are directed (Exodus xxx. 18—21.) to wash their Hands and their Feet at the Laver, Verse 19—not to bathe the whole Body) And again, Verse 21. So shall they wash their Hands and their Feet, that they die not.

† Dr. Wall's Defence, &c. page 111.

10 Dipping, not the only scriptural

ALL the Jews—If the Pharisaic Severity might, possibly, subject those very precise Persons to such a total Immersion, at all Times, even in the depth of Winter, whenever they came from Market; it can never be imagined, that ALL the Jews did the same. Dr. Pocock proves, from Maimonides and the whole Body of the Rabbins, that the Jews had no such custom ||. Some, indeed, to weaken this Testimony of the Rabbins, have alleged the many whimsical and silly notions with which their Writings abound: but this is, certainly, it self extremely weak. The enquiry is about a national custom, a common, familiar, well known Fact. Were their Heads so strangely turned that they could not transmit to us a credible Account what their national Usage was as to washing the Hands? Should a Papist, or Mahometan be called into a Court of Judicature to give Testimony to any public, indifferent Fact; would not any Person draw upon himself the smiles of the Court, who should attempt to set aside their Evidence, by alleging their absurd notions and speculations in Religion?

OTHERS aware of the Force of this Text, endeavour to evade it by a different Rendering, viz. And what they buy in the Market, unless it be washed, dipt, they eat not. † But this will, by no means, help off the difficulty. They might, indeed, thus baptize, or dip, the Flesh and Herbs they brought from the Market; but did they also dip their Corn, Honey, Meal, Salt, Oyl, Milk, &c?

OTHERS object,— That, not to suppose the Evangelist here to mean a total Immersion, by

Cat.

|| Vid. Wall. Ibid.

† Dr. Gale's Reflexions, &c. page 167.

and primitive manner of Baptizing. II

*εαντικαντιον*, is to make him guilty of an insipid Tautology. For after having said, Verse 3. *The Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their Hands oft, eat not.* He would not immediately have added, Verse 4. *And when they come from the Market, except they wash they eat not*—had not this latter washing been something different from the former. But, why not? Is it not quite proper to say—*The Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their Hands oft* (*πυγμιν sedulò, crebro, saepissimè*, so the Syriac. Casaub. Vulg. Erasm. Arab. i. e. frequently and carefully) *eat not.* And (particularly, one occasion, in which they are wont thus carefully to wash, is) *when they come from the Market*; for then, *except they wash they eat not.*

In the same *Mark vii. 4.* we read of the *Washing* (Gr. *βαπτίσμις* the *BAPTISMS*) of *Cups, and Pots, and Κλινων* of *Beds.* Did they wash their *Couches* and *Beds* by putting them wholly under *Water*? No; this Word *βαπτίσμις Baptisms*, says Dr. *Lightfoot* \*, does not always signify *Dipping* or putting under Water; but sometimes washing only, or even Sprinkling.

*I Cor. x. 1, 2.* The Apostle says — *All our Fathers were under the Cloud, and all passed through the Sea, and were all BAPTIZED into Moses, εαντικαντιον εν τη νεφελη καὶ εν τη θαλάσσῃ by the Cloud and by the Sea.* But how were they baptized IN, or BY, the Cloud, and BY the Sea? By being immersed into, or totally overwhelmed with them? Most certainly, not. The *Egyptians* were thus baptized: The *Israelites* were not. For it is said, *Exod. xiv. 21, 22. The Lord caused the Sea to go back, by a strong East Wind, all that Night, and made the Sea*

\* Vid. Poli. Syn. in Loc.

12 *Dipping, not the only scriptural*

DRY LAND ; and the Waters were DIVIDED ; And the children of Israel went into the midst of the Sea, upon the DRY GROUND ; and the Waters were a Wall unto them on their right Hand, and on their left. Note, though they might possibly be said to be covered or overwhelmed by the Cloud ; yet so were they not, nor could they be, by the SEA. The Sea, it is undeniable, never overwhelmed, or covered, them at all : Yet behold ! they are expressly said to be baptized in, or by, the SEA, as well as by the Cloud. Their being baptized, then, by the Sea, must signify something else besides being immersed into, or covered or overwhelmed with it. What, then, does it mean ? Or How were they baptized by it ?—As GOD sent a strong East-Wind to drive back and divide the Waters ; the same Instrument was, no doubt, employed to continue them in this State. Now by the mighty Agitation into which the Waters were cast, by this violent Repulsion ; and the strong Wind at the same Time furiously blowing ; it is easy to conceive the passing Israelites must be Sprinkled with the Spray of the tossing Waves, and thus were baptized by it.

HERE, then, is another incontestable instance of a Scripture-Baptism without Immersion. The Israelites are expressly said to be baptized in, or by, the Sea, as well as by the Cloud ; yet no one will presume to say they were buried or overwhelmed in it.

IN further Confirmation of this Sense of the Word, *κατεβαίνειν, to baptize,* I beg leave to ask — What is the real Nature or Design of Christian Baptism ? It is unquestionably but an emblematical, or figurative Thing. But what is the Water, in this religious Rite, designed to figure or represent ? Undoubt-

and primitive manner of Baptizing. 13

Undoubtedly the HOLY-GHOST\*. This is frequently, in Scripture, spoken of and promised, under the Emblem of Water†: And is represented as the great Instrument of purifying, refreshing and strengthening the Soul, as Water is of the Body. Accordingly, John says, I indeed baptize you with WATER; but He, Christ, shall baptize you with the HOLY-GHOST—Except a Person is born of WATER, and of the SPIRIT — Repent, and be BAPTIZED, every one of you, and ye shall receive the gift of the HOLY-GHOST — Can any forbid WATER, that these should not be baptized, who have received the HOLY-GHOST? — The WASHING of Regeneration and the renewing of the HOLY-GHOST — It is, therefore, carefully to be observed, that the WATER, which in Christian Baptism is applied to the Body, being intended as an Emblem of the HOLY-SPIRIT, which is promised to the Soul, to sanctify and cleanse it; it will throw great Light on the present Subject to take notice in what MANNER this SPIRIT is represented, in Scripture, as communicated or given to us. Are we, generally, represented as immersed into, or overwhelmed with the SPIRIT: Or else, as having it POURED DOWN upon us? Undoubtedly by the latter.

By one SPIRIT we are all BAPTIZED into one Body—And, He shall BAPTIZE you with the HOLY-GHOST and with Fire. How was this done? The Scripture itself informs us — viz. By the HOLY-GHOST descending, and SITTING ON THEM, in the

\* See Luke iii. 16. John iii. 5. Acts i. 5. ii. 38. x. 47.  
1 Cor. xiii. 13. Tit. iii. 5.

† Isai. xliv. 3. Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 27. John iv. 10, 14.  
John vii. 38, 39.

4 Dipping, not the only scriptural  
*the form of cloven Tongues of Fire*\*. Note, They  
 were not overwhelmed, or covered, with the Fire,  
 when they were baptized with it; but it only fell  
 upon, and rested on them. And see how St. Peter  
 remarks upon this Fact, namely, their being  
 baptized with the HOLY-GHOST, and it's resting on  
 them in the form of Fire! Verses 16, 17, 18.  
*This is that, which was spoken by the Prophet Joel,*  
*and it shall come to pass in the last Days, saith God,*  
*I will POUR OUT of my Spirit UPON all Flesh —*  
*And ON my Servants, and ON my Hand-maids I will*  
*POUR OUT, in those Days, of my SPIRIT.* Ob-  
 serve, THIS is THAT which was spoken — i. e. By  
 this Fact, of our Baptism with the Spirit, is that  
 Prophecy, I will pour out, fulfilled — So Acts  
 x. 44, 45. And xi. 15, 16. When Peter, and  
 the Jews which were with him, saw the HOLY-  
 GHOST ~~επειχθαι επι ταύτην~~, FALL ON,  
 and POURED OUT UPON the Gentiles; then re-  
 membered I, says he, the word of the Lord, how that  
 he said, John indeed BAPTIZED with Water; but  
 ye shall be BAPTIZED with the HOLY-GHOST.  
 Hence, then, it is most evident, that this POUR-  
 ING OUT of the SPIRIT, which Peter saw, was  
 that BAPTISM with the SPIRIT of which CHRIST  
 spake; and of which Baptism with Water was an  
 intended Emblem or Sign.

SEE also, how the Apostle Paul, Tit. iii. 5, 6.  
 joins the Sign, and the Thing signified; and illu-  
 strates the one, by the other. The washing of Re-  
 generation (i. e. the baptismal Water, the Sign)  
 and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, (the Thing sig-  
 nified by it, not, with which we are overwhelmed,  
 nor into which we are dipt, but) which he bath

SHED

SHED ~~SEX~~POURED OUT UPON us abundantly—  
So then, the Manner in which we all, by one SPIRIT, are BAPTIZED into one Body, is by having that SPIRIT shed down, or POURED OUT upon us; and of the imparting to us this SPIRIT, the baptismal Water is the appointed Emblem, Representation or Sign. Let it hence, then, be now fairly and impartially judged — In what manner this Water is most significantly applied — If Baptism, by Immersion, be allowed to be more significative of a Death unto Sin, as is usually urged from Colos. ii. 12; Sprinkling or Pouring on, surely, is much more significative of the promise of the HOLY-SPIRIT, and of it's cleansing, supporting, and quickening Influences; which is the principal Thing intended to be represented, and shewed forth, in this Ceremony.

I beg leave farther to observe—In the Christian Scheme, every true Disciple is represented as being consecrated a King, and a Priest; a royal priesthood to GOD \*, when admitted into the Christian Church. Now the divinely-appointed Rite of Consecration to these Offices, was *unction*, or POURING ON them the sacred Oyl. But the BAPTISM of Christians, is their *Inauguration* into these Offices; and the HOLY-GHOST, represented by the baptismal Water, is expressly called the *unction* or *Anointing* †, by which we are consecrated to them. Now Baptism by *Affusion*, is a significant and lively Emblem of this *unction* or *Consecration*; whereas, in the mode of *Immersion*, this part of the allusion is entirely lost.

AGAIN. Was not the baptismal Water designed to signify and represent, that purging from an evil

\* 1 Pet. ii. 9. Rev. v. 10.

† 1 John ii. 20, 27.

16 Dipping, not the only scriptural

evil Conscience ; that cleansing or Purification ; which we obtain by the Blood of CHRIST ? But, are we ever spoken of in Scripture as overwhelmed with, or *dipt into*, that Blood of the Son of God ? Is it not, on the contrary, always represented as sprinkled upon us ?

FINALLY, The Circumstances or State of those in the Ark\*, is said to be a Figure, or Resemblance, of Christian Baptism ; but they were not *dipt into* the Water and taken up again ; as it is contended baptized Persons ought to be ; but only had Water poured down upon them.

FROM these Observations on the Sense of the Word, *Baptizω* to baptize, in the New Testament ; We proceed to it's Use in the greek Version of the old, and in the Apocrypha. And here it is found but in the four following places.

ECCLUS. xxxiv. 26. The Person who was purified after the touch of a dead Body, is called *εαυτον βαπτισμένον*, one baptized. Now the Ceremony of his Purification consisted chiefly, if not entirely, in SPRINKLING Water upon him, See Numb. xix. 18. *And a clean Person shall take Hyssop and dip it in the Water, and SPRINKLE IT upon the Tent, and upon him that touched a Bone, &c.* And this Water which was to be sprinkled, is emphatically and expressly called the Water of Separation, and a Purification for Sin, Verse 9. There is mention indeed Verse 19. of washing his Cloaths and bathe himself in Water. But this may, possibly, be understood not of the sprinkled, but of the SPRINKLER ; who, it is plain from Verse 21. contracted a defilement from his sprinkling, and even touching the water of Separation ; But as for the Person sprinkled, from Verse 12. it seems to follow that  
the

\* 1 Pet. iii. 21.

the mere Sprinkling the Water on him, the third and the seventh Days, was all requisite to his cleansing. But supposing that he was also obliged to bathe his Flesh; it is most evident that this Bathing was not that Application of Water in which the Ceremony of his Cleansing chiefly consisted, nor on which his Purification is made to depend, but the SPRINKLING it upon him. This fully appears from Verses 13, 20, where the Person, who had neglected this ceremonial Purification, is threatened to be cut off. For what? For not having bathed his Body? Nothing like it. No, but in each distinct threatening, his Guilt is expressly made to consist, in his NOT having the water of Purification SPRINKLED upon him. And the Apostle, it is observable, speaking of this very same Purification, makes the efficacy of the Ceremony to consist entirely in the SPRINKLING; without the least mention of the Bathing. For if the Blood of Bulls and of Goats, and the Ashes of a Heifer, (with which this Water of Purification was made) SPRINKLING the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the Flesh, how much more, &c \*. But the Person thus purified is here called Βαπτιζομενος ONE BAPTIZED.

IN Judith xii. 7. It is said—She went out, in the Night, into the Valley of Bethulia and washed εγκαθιζετο and WAS BAPTIZED, in a Fountain of Water, by the Camp. Did she dip her whole Body in this Fountain of Water? Yes, some earnestly contend. But utterly without Reason, and against all Probability. For as there appears to have been but this single Fountain in the valley of Bethulia; at, close by, or around which (επ την πλην Verse 3.) an Army of above two hundred thousand Soldiers lay incamped, it is the height of absurdity

## 18 Dipping, not the only scriptural

ty to imagine that *Judith*, in the Night, could with any Convenience or Modesty unclothe her self and plunge her whole Body therein : Or, if she could ; that the *Soldiers* would have suffered it ; in a Country, where *Water* was both so much needed and so scarce ; and so prodigious an Army, with it's infinite Multitude of Attendants and Cattle, were to be continually supplied from it. When therefore it is said, she ~~εκπλευτο εν τη ναμαργανη της πηγης της υδρίας~~ \* was baptized in the Camp, at the Fountain of Water, (this is the exact rendering) it may be left to any one to judge— Whether, she was totally immersed, or had the Water applied only to a Part of her Body. This, then, must be accounted another very clear and *incontestable Instance*, where a Person is said to be baptized, without being overwhelmed.

*ISAIAH* xxii. 4. It is said, *η Αριστα με Κατίζει Iniquity baptizes me.* This Passage is confessedly an Error of the seventy. But it seems to allude to a Form of speaking exceeding common in the Scriptures, where God is represented as Pouring out his Fury or Wrath, upon Transgressors. So *Jer.* xiv. 16. *I will POUR their Wickedness upon them.* and *Rev.* xvi. 2. The Vengeance Heaven executes upon Kingdoms and Nations is represented as Poured out from a Vial, or Cup. Now, the penal effects of Sin being thus usually represented as poured out upon Men ; it is a beautiful and easy Figure to speak of *Iniquity* as POURING them out.

THE only remaining Passage is, *2 Kings v. 14. Then went he, (Naaman) down and dipped himself εκπλευτο washed or baptized himself) seven times,*

\* Note, It is not *εις πηγην* which might be rendered in the Fountain ; but *επει της πηγης at the Fountain.*

in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God. This is the only Place, in the whole Bible, where *Cantique* is rendered *to dip*; nor is it all necessary that it be so rendered here. Naaman, it is plain, expected that the Prophet should have come and *broke his Hand over the Place, and recovered the Leper*. See Verse 11. Instead of this, he bids him—*Go, and wash in Jordan SEVEN TIMES.* Verse 10. Then went he down (i. e. either from his Chariot, or from Samaria to the River Jordan) and *washed seven Times*, according to the Saying—It is now enquired—Whether he plunged himself all over seven times? Or, whether he only sprinkled or poured Water seven Times upon the leprous Place?—There is nothing in the Expression, (by which the Command is given,) *wash*, to determine it; for this may be alike understood either of a *total*, or a *partial*, washing; but there is a remarkable Circumstance which seems to give it strongly for the latter: Which is this. The Prophet, in commanding him to *wash SEVEN TIMES*, alludes, no doubt, to the Manner of cleansing the Leper appointed by the Jewish Law. Now there were two ways of applying Water to the Leper's Body, enjoined by that Law; both alike commanded, and necessary to his Cleansing, viz. *Batbing*, and *Sprinkling*: The former, *Batbing*, to be used but once; the latter, *Sprinkling*, to be done *Seven Times*. See Levit. xiv. 7, 8. When, therefore, the Prophet bids him—*Wash SEVEN TIMES*, it is much more natural to understand it of *Sprinkling*, or *Pouring Water*, *SEVEN TIMES* upon the leprous Part (over which he expected the Prophet should have *broked his Hand*) than of *Dipping his whole Body SEVEN TIMES*; of which kind of *washing* there

20 Dipping, not the only scriptural

is not the least Footstep nor Shadow in the *Law*—  
So the blind Man is commanded, *John ix. 7.*  
*Go wash in the Pool of Siloam.* When not his  
whole Body, doubtless, but only his Eyes, be-  
smear'd with Clay, were to be washed.

THUS have we considered the *Scripture Sense*  
of the word *βαπτίζω* to baptize; and have, it is  
presumed, fully proved it to be used when the  
Act of Pouring, or Sprinkling, not Dipping is in-  
tended — Amongst a Multitude of Authorities  
which might be produced from other *Writers*,  
in confirmation of the same, I shall only beg  
leave to mention one from *Origen* \*. He is  
speaking of *John's Baptism*; and considering  
him as the *Elias*, he says — “ How came you  
“ to think that *Elias* when he should come would  
“ baptize, who did not, in *Abab's time*, baptize  
“ the Wood upon the Altar, but orders the Priests  
“ to do that; not only once, but says do it a  
“ second Time, and they did it the second Time—  
“ He therefore who did not himself baptize then,  
“ but assigned the Work to others, &c.” — Now  
the *Act* which *Origen* here calls *Baptizing*, and  
which *Elias* ordered the Priests to perform, was  
not Dipping the Wood into Water, but POUR-  
ING Water on it. See *1 Kings xviii. 33.* *Fill four  
Barrels of Water, and POUR IT—on the Wood.*

THE Force of the Word *βαπτίζω* having been  
thus carefully examined, it may, in the opinion  
of some, at least, throw some Light on this En-  
quiry, to observe—That as *Water-Baptism* is  
confessedly but a *figurative Thing*; so the Scrip-  
tures frequently speak of God's giving or im-  
parting to us those very *spiritual Blessings*, which  
the *Water* in *christian Baptism* was designed to

\* Comment. in *Joan. p. 116. D.*

*and primitive manner of Baptizing.* 21

represent as given or imparted, under the Figure of SPRINKLING or POURING. Thus, when David prays — *Purge me with Hyssop* \* (alluding to the Rite of SPRINKLING with Hyssop) and I shall be clean. He means the very same Thing, viz. Pardon, or Justification, which is signified by the baptismal Water, corresponding to which are the words of Ananias, *Acts xxii. 16. Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy Sins.* When Ezekiel † speaks of God's gathering the Jews from among the Heathen, purging them from their Uncleanness, and forming them into a Church, or peculiar People under his Protection (the very Things which are intended to be represented by Christian Baptism) what Figure does he use? *I will SPRINKLE clean Water upon them, and they shall be clean.* So when Isaiab describes the Blessings of the MESSIAH's Kingdom, or of the Christian Dispensation (when the Blessing of Abraham, even the Promise of the SPIRIT, was to come upon the Nations ‡) he does it under the same Figure—*He shall SPRINKLE many Nations ||.* And, *I will POUR WATER upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry Ground; I will POUR MY SPIRIT upon thy Seed, and my Blessing upon thine Offspring §.* Now from these, and other like Passages, it may be fairly argued thus—Forasmuch as the Water in Christian Baptism applied to the Body, is confessedly but an emblematical or figurative Thing, and was intended to represent some spiritual Blessing to be imparted to the Soul; and forasmuch as this spiritual Blessing, which is intended to be represented by it, is in the old Testament often spoken of, as to be given when the new should take place,

\*Psal. li. 7. †Ezek. xxxvi. 25. ‡Gal. iii. 14. || Isai. lii. 15. § xliv. 3.

22 Dipping, not the only scriptural place, under the Emblem of Water sprinkled or poured out ; it follows, that if the Word *εαντζω* to baptize will at all admit of this Sense, then it is perfectly agreeable to the *Analogy of Scripture* to administer the baptismal Water by Sprinkling or Pouring.

IT further strengthens this Argument to observe—That these very spiritual Blessings, of which the baptismal Water was the appointed Emblem or Figure, are in the New Testament also spoken of as actually imparted to us under the Figure of Sprinkling or Pouring. Thus, we are said to have our Hearts SPRINKLED from an evil Conscience \* or a consciousness of Guilt. To be come to the Blood of SPRINKLING †. To be chosen through Sanctification of the Spirit, and SPRINKLING of the Blood of JESUS ‡. And to have an Unction, or Anointing, from the Holy One ||, poured on us—Now what, I ask, is meant by all these emblematical and figurative Expressions ? Is it not Remission, Justification, or the Holy-Spirit : the very Things which the Water, in this christian Ceremony, was intended to be an Emblem of ?

BUT it is objected—John was baptizing in Aenon BECAUSE there was much Water there §. Does not this very clearly and certainly imply that he baptized the Multitudes by Dipping ? I apprehend, not at all. For there were other necessary and important Uses for \*\* πολλα υδατα many Waters besides Dipping the Multitudes ; other weighty and just Causes why John should chuse this well-watered and fruitful Country for the scene of his Ministrations ; and not that desert and barren Region,

\* Heb. x. 22. † xii. 24. ‡ 1 Pet. i. 2. || 1 John ii. 20, 27. § John iii. 23. \*\* πολλα υδατα many Rivers, a well-watered Country.

where he before sojourned ; that dry and thirsty Land (as the Psalmist \* calls it) where no Water is. Let it be considered—How valuable and scarce Water was in those Parts—How hot the Climate—How numerous the crowds which flocked to John's Baptism—From how distant Parts they came—How long they tarried to hear his Doctrine and Instructions ; for the mere act of *Baptizing* was the least part of John's Mission and of the People's End in flocking to him—Let these be considered, and there will appear sundry good Reasons for his chusing this well watered and fruitful Country for the place of his Preaching, without any regard had to the convenience of Dipping. That THIS therefore was the Reason of his making this Choice, does by no means appear. So 2 Chron. xxxii. 4. They stopped all the Fountains and Brooks—Saying, why should the Kings of Assyria come and find MUCH WATER ? For what ? Why, to drink and refresh their Army.

AND here it cannot be improper to ask—If these multitudes were all dipt ; How was it done ? Were they naked ? This Modesty forbids. Had they all Change of Raiment, to undress, and put on dry Apparel, when they came out of the Water ? This the Vastness of the Multitudes, the Openness of the Country, and the great Distance whence they came, will not easily admit. And that they stood in their wet Garments, and hearkened to John's Doctrine ; or travelled in them many Miles to their Homes, seems equally improbable. I pretend to no Certainty that John did not dip at all. But, as he had seen, by the express Appointment of God, Water applied both Ways to the human Body,

for

\* Psal. lxiii. 1.

for ceremonial Purification, viz. by Sprinkling and Dipping ; and both these are by the SPIRIT, which sent him to baptize, actually called Baptisms, it is possible, he might use both ways of Administration, according as the circumstances of Time, Place, and Persons required \*.

So

\* It seems an Observation of some Weight in this Debate — That as Water was used by divine Appointment under the Jewish Law in a figurative and sacramental Manner, or as an Emblem of moral Purity ; and the Christian Ceremony of BAPTIZING is, undoubtedly, adopted from this Usage under the Law ; so the only Way, in which one Person (the Priest) was ever directed or known to use it upon ANOTHER, for this symbolical or sacramental Purpose, was by Sprinkling or Pouring it on, NEVER by Dipping him into it.

There were diverse Baptisms under the Law : Heb. ix. 10. These Baptisms were generally performed by the Priest ; but the Priest amongst the various Rites he is directed to use, to sanctify and cleanse a Person, and receive him into the Church, is never once directed to dip or plunge him in Water, but only to sprinkle or pour it upon him.

The Priest's PLUNGING a Person, in order to his Separation or Cleansing, is a Ceremony quite strange, and absolutely unheard of through all the sacred Records. Persons were, indeed, on some Occasions, directed to plunge or bathe themselves ; But that one Man should take another, and plunge him under Water, is a Thing utterly uncommanded, unprecedented, and unknown, throughout the whole Constitution and History of the Jewish Church. It may, therefore, strongly be presumed, not to have been the Practice either of John or of Jesus Christ when the Christian was set up.

For John being of the priestly Race ; and beginning his ministrations agreeable to their Law, at thirty years old ; and using, like them, an Application of Water to the Body as an Emblem of moral Purity ; it is left to any impartial judgment—Whether he is, most rationally, supposed to have plunged Men under Water ( a Thing unpractised amongst them) Or, whether he only sprinkled or poured Water on them, (a Rite divinely instituted, and every Day familiarly practised in that Church.)

If

So, that the *Taylor* + and his whole Family ; who were all taught, converted and baptized about *Midnight* without any previous Thought of, or Preparation for this Ceremony ; had it done by *Dipping*— As, likewise, that *Saul* afterwards *St. Paul*, having neither eaten nor drank † for *three Days before* ; and being greatly *enfeebled*, by the mighty Shock which he received from the *Vision* in the Way, as well as by the great *Remorse* with which he reviewed, and repented of, his Crimes ; and it being now also in the *Depth of Winter* § ; as the learned have supposed ; that, in this *weakly* and *feeble State*, I say, *he arose and was baptized*, by being totally put under *Water*.—And finally, that the *three thousand* \* also, who were converted at *Jerusalem*, and baptized in one Day, were all overwhelmed — seems, to say the least, to have scarce an Air of Probability.

NOR will the Circumstance of *Philip* and the *Eunuch* going down (ες) UNTO † the *Water* ; and coming up (εκ) FROM it \*\*, with any certainty prove, that he there *dipt* him. For as waters run in the *Valleys*, they might go down from the *Chariot* ες to, or unto, the *Rivulet* (for Geographers find

E

If it be said — But that Question of the *Jews* — “ *Why baptizest thou, if thou art not that Prophet?* ” implies there was something new and unprecedent in *John’s Baptism*. The answer is obvious. 1. That it could not be his *merely using* the ceremony of *Baptizing* which occasioned this enquiry, because it was, confessedly, a Ceremony perfectly well-known and familiar amongst them. But, 2. It was his *using* this Ceremony upon the *Israelites* or *Jewish Nation* ; who looked upon themselves as a *People already HOLY*, and in *Covenant with G O D* ; and therefore not to need this Ceremony of cleansing or separation, under which the *Gentiles* were wont to pass, when received into the *Church*.

+ *Act*s xvi. 33. † ix. 9, 18. § About the 25th of January. \* *Act*s viii. 41. †† viii. 38, 39.

\*\* Note, The greek Particles ες and εκ are thus rendered unto, and from, the one several hundred, the other above hundred times in the new Testament.

26 Dipping, not the only scriptural

but little streams there) and Philip baptize, by Pouring Water on him; and from thence go up to the Chariot again, in the most perfect Consistence with this account of the Matter.

So, when the People of Judea are said to be baptized of John εν τῷ Ἰορδάνῳ in the River Jordan: And, that Jesus, when baptized, came up out of επος τε υδατος FROM the Water; It will by no means hence follow, that they were totally plunged under it. For, it being the custom of those Countries to wear Sandals only on their naked Feet; and the washing these being, amongst them, a very familiar and delightful Thing; the going down into the Water, to have it poured upon their Heads, is quite natural and likely. So that the arguments drawn hence also in Favour of Over-whelming will in no wise conclude.

BUT the chief Argument for Immersion is taken from Rom. vi. 4. and Colos. ii. 12. Where it is said that we are buried with CHRIST by Baptism into Death; and buried with him by Baptism.

Now, here, let it be considered. 1. That the weight of the Argument rests entirely upon the Supposition, that the Apostle in these Passages alludes to the MODE of christian Baptism; which

\* Note, The laying any Weight on it's being said — were baptized IN Jordan — shews extreme ignorance of the Original. For, 1. The Word [εν] here translated [in] is in no less than a hundred and fifty places of the new Testament (a learned Gentleman hath observed) rendered [with]. And had it thus been rendered here — baptized with Jordan — meaning, WITH the Water of that River; it would have been a Form of Speaking, neither more figurative nor improper, than is familiar both in Scripture and in common Life. But, to lay no Stress on this.

2. The Word [εν] is more than a hundred Times in the new Testament rendered [at] and εν τῷ Ἰορδάνῳ may most justly be rendered AT the River Jordan; And so, the whole strength of the Argument, from John's baptizing IN Jordan, evaporates at once.

and primitive manner of Baptizing. 27

can with no Certainty be proved. For, 2. The Apostle in both Places may be justly understood as speaking, not concerning the external and ceremonial Part of christian Baptism, but concerning the internal and moral Part; not concerning the Application of WATER, which has no Power to kill, or destroy, the Body of Sin; but concerning the regenerating Influences of the SPIRIT; by which SPIRIT the Scriptures often speak of Christians as baptized; and by the Influences of which SPIRIT, (or in Consequence of their Baptism by which) alone it is, that they are said to be dead \*. Dead with Christ †. Dead to Sin ‡. Now as this SPIRIT only has power to kill, or destroy, the old Man, (to use the Apostle's Phrase) and to make us dead with Christ, and dead to Sin; And as we are very frequently represented as baptized with this SPIRIT; It is perfectly natural to understand the Apostle as speaking of these internal and moral influences of the SPIRIT, when he tells Christians — that they were buried with CHRIST by Baptism into Death, &c. And it is further observable — That we are, in this Discourse of the Apostle, as much said to be crucified and circumcised by, or with, CHRIST, as we are to be buried with him: And Baptism is as expressly styled the Circumcision of Christ, or the christian Circumcision, as a Burial with Christ. Why, then, must we not in administering this Ceremony, seek for some visible allusion to the one, as well as to the other?

THE Apostle, it is manifest, is here all along talking in figurative Terms; such as planted, crucified, dead, buried, rising, walking, reigning — his mere use of the Word buried, then, seems a much too feeble bottom to rest an Argument upon. It may be said, there is as much necessity of finding something, in the christian Worship, answering to the

other figurative expressions, as to this single one of being buried: And that Persons baptized should be signed with the Cross, to signify, that their old Man is crucified; as that they should be put under Water to signify their being buried with Christ \*.

BUT 3. Were it absolutely certain, which it by no means is, that the Apostle doth here allude to the Mode of christian Baptism; All that will follow is—That Immersion was the most usual, but not that it was the ONLY Way of administering this Rite; and this at *Colossi* and at *Rome* only, and the warmer regions of the World: But not that it was the most

\* I beg leave here to subjoin the Note of a very learned and ingenious writer on this Passage—*Colos. ii. 12. Buried with him in Baptism*—The Apostle frequently speaks of Christians as being very closely united to Christ, as members of his Body, and parts of his Person. *Eph. i. 23. v. 30.* Consequently, whatever was done to Christ, was, as it were, at the same Time done to them. When He was crucified; his Members were crucified, *Gal. ii. 20.* When CHRIST was quickened; They were quickened together with Him, *Eph. ii. 5,* Because He lives, they shall live also. *John xiv. 19.* When CHRIST was raised; they were raised. *Eph. ii. 6.* And when He ascended and sat down in Heaven, they sat down with him there. *Ibid.* Now, in the same Sense, it is true, that Christians were buried with Christ (i. e. when CHRIST was buried, they, as Members and Parts of him, were buried with him) *as the Christians either in Baptism, or by means of Baptism.* If we chuse the former Rendering, the Meaning must be—that at the Time of our being baptized, we were united to Christ; and consequently then looked upon as having been buried with him. If we prefer the latter Rendering, viz. By means of Baptism (which seems best, because in the parallel Place, *Rom. vi. 4.* the Apostle uses θάνατος), then the Sense will be—it is by means of Baptism that we are united to CHRIST, and so must be considered as having been buried, when he was buried. Which ever Rendering we take, we may be allowed to say, by Analogy, the same Things of our being crucified, quickened and risen with CHRIST; all which also happened by means of our Baptism, and at the Time of our being baptized.

As then, there can be no Reference to a Mode of Baptism, in our being crucified and quickened by Baptism: So, there is no Reason to suppose any Reference to a Mode of Baptism, (Dipping) when we are said to be buried with Christ by Baptism.

most usual, much less the ONLY Way, in all other the most northern and coldest Climates of the Earth. But, if it was not the ONLY Way; not only there, but throughout the whole christian World; no argument can hence be drawn, that Baptism must always be administered in this Manner.

FINALLY, should it be granted, that these two Texts (*Rom. vi. 4.* and *Colos. ii. 12.*) favour the mode of Dipping: It must certainly be also allowed, that the several Texts, above cited, do equally favour Sprinkling, or Pouring, in Baptism. So that the matter may admit of an easy Compromise, by supposing—That as this christian Ceremony undoubtedly had it's Origin, and was borrowed, from the jewissh Law; and as Persons and Things were purified, or set apart, under that Law, sometimes by Dipping, and sometimes by Sprinkling; So the Apostles performed this ceremonial Purification in the christian Church, sometimes in one Form, and sometimes in the other; as the Circumstances of Time, Place, Persons—required.

LET us now briefly review, and sum up the evidence upon the Point in Debate—That the word *Baptizo* to baptize does not necessarily, nor constantly, signify to dip; but is very frequently, if not generally, used in sacred Writ in a more large and extensive Sense; and signifies an application of Water by Sprinkling or Pouring, has been evidently shewn; and the whole learned World, (an Anti-pædobaptist or two, perhaps, excepted) readily acknowledge\*—We have also seen—That there were, under the Jewissh Law, DIFFERENT Ways of applying Water for ceremonial Purification, which are expressly called DIFFERENT Baptisms: Dipping, therefore, in the Scripture Judgment, is not the

ONLY

\* See a Cloud of Witnesses from Lexicographers, Divines, Grammarians—in WALKER's *Doctrine of Baptisms*.

ONLY way of Baptizing—That our Lord is said not to have been baptized before Dinner; and that all the Jews when they came from Market eat not, except they are baptized; when not a *Plunging* the whole Body is meant, but only *washing the Hands*—That the Apostle actually says, *the Jewish Fathers were all BAPTIZED IN THE SEA*; when the Fact is incontestable that they were not overwhelmed, or covered, with the Sea; but only sprinkled with it's Spray—That John says of CHRIST that he should **BAPTIZE** the Disciples with the HOLY-GHOST and with FIRE; which **BAPTIZING** them was performed, not by their being overwhelmed, or immersed, in the Holy Ghost and in Fire; but by it's being poured out, and Resting on them—in the greek version of the Apocrypha we have seen a Person stiled, *Baptizouen*, one baptized; when the principal Part, if not the whole Ceremony, of his cleansing, consisted in *sprinkling Water* on him—that Judith is said to have *baptized her self*; when the Circumstances of the Story will, by no means, suffer us to imagine, that she *dipped her self wholly*, but only *washed her self in Part*—That in Origen, the Priests at Elijah's command are said to *baptize the Wood* upon the Altar, when they only *poured Water on it*—We have seen farther: That from several Circumstances attending those who were baptized; viz. the vast Multitudes of both Sexes, baptized by John in the open Country, far distant from their Habitations; Paul, under extreme Weakness and after several days Fasting; the Taylor and his Family, at midnight, and in their own House, immediately upon their sudden conversion; and the several Thousands in one Day, by the Apostles at Jerusalem; it seems highly improbable that they were all totally *plunged*—Finally, That viewing the matter with the Eye of impartial REASON, pouring Water on the Body, as effectually, and fully answers all the moral

real Ends of Baptism, as Dipping into it; Yea, is much more significative of one principal Thing intended to be represented or signified by this christian Rite, namely, the Giving us the HOLY SPIRIT, that *Unitio from above*, which is poured down upon us—

THESE Things being considered, it seems not a little strange, that some, who profess to think freely in Religion, lay so great a stress upon Baptism by Dipping only—That they make it to enter into the very ESSENCE of christian Baptism—That they think it justifiable to break off from the Churches of their Fellow-Christians partly on this account—And can, without a smile, hear the few Brethren of that way speaking of themselves as the ONLY BAPTIZED CHRISTIANS; and looking upon the whole christian World, besides themselves, as to the matter of christian Baptism, as being much upon a level with Hottentots and Pagans.

BUT such consider not, with due attention, the consequences of their Opinion; nor observe, how this Preciseness as to ritual Matters naturally genders Strife, and ministers Occasion to endless, contemptible, and foolish Debates. For if Overwhelming the Person be of the ESSENCE of christian Baptism, hence obviously springs a Doubt — What if the Person, when laying beneath the Water, should lift up a Hand, so as to be not quite covered with the Element; Is the Person, nevertheless, truly baptized? Or, suppose in the great Hurry which such an Operation may occasion, both the Hands, or even the Arms, should be so incautiously extended as not to be overwhelmed; I ask, is that Baptism good? Or again, If through the Bulk of the baptized, and the Weakness of the Baptizer, some part even of the Face or Head should be uncovered; What is to be pronounced concerning such a Baptism? Is it valid, or not? Suppose the Person whose Hands, or part of whose

Face.

*Face*, was not quite overwhelmed, should be desired by the Administrator to submit to a second Dipping, because the first being not TOTAL, he thinks not to be SUFFICIENT ; and either Himself, or some attending Friends, should steadily refuse ; alleging, the Defect to be not material ; and that the Baptism was valid—Would there not hence arise a very important Debate ; perhaps, an actual Separation, or Rent in that Church ? Some insisting, that the Person be received to full Communion, as a truly baptized Brother : Others strenuously opposing, and refusing Communion with him as not being baptized, because not TOTALLY overwhelmed.—How much to the Edification and Honour of the christian World would such a Contest appear ! What matter of Ridicule would it furnish to Unbelievers ! And how naturally draw Contempt ; not upon Baptism only, as a solemn Trifle ; but upon Christianity it self, as ministering Occasion to such frivolous Debates ! And yet, really, to this Issue, does the making Immersion ESSENTIAL to christian Baptism, naturally and directly tend. If it does not, in Fact, gender such Debates ; it is because those, who avow the Principle, do not follow it into all it's Consequences, nor closely adhere to it in every Emergence of this kind. The Greek Christians, who dip their Infants, hold it necessary that EVERY PART of the Child be dipped. And so the Jews of old held \* “ That if a Man be baptized all over, saving the Tip of his little Finger ; or if Clay, or any the like Thing, cleave to the Flesh of Man, and keep it from the Water, it is unclean still as it was, and the Baptizing profiteth nothing.”—

And, if washing the whole Body be of such Moment in christian Baptism, as our Brethren represent ; They ought, surely, to consider, that the Dipping a cloathed Body seems not a strictly just or adequate

\* See Ainsworth on Levit. xv. 11.

adequate Performance of it. The *Baptisms* of the Jewish Law were, doubtless, of the *naked Body*. And it is an incontestable Fact that in the primitive Times, (those of *Cbryostom*, and the Ages after) Such as were baptized by *Dipping*, were *naked* when baptized \*—

Nor ought it to be overlooked; that, upon this Scheme of our Brethren, there are two Parts of the character of an *able Minister of the New Testament*, which St. Paul, in his Epistles both to *Timothy* and *Titus*, entirely omits: Yea, which neither *Himself*, nor his beloved *Timothy*, seem to have possessed; viz., *Hardiness of Constitution*, and *bodily Strength*. Without a good degree of these, in a variety of Cases which must frequently occur, it will be rash and highly criminal for a *christian Minister* to give this *sacred Rite* of Religion to some of the most worthy and capable Subjects: Inasmuch, as he cannot do it without apparent Hazard, not only to his own Life, but to that also of the *Baptized*.

Besides, after all the *ceremonial Zeal* and *Fulfillment of all Righteousness*, which is pretended in this Point; The Person *dipt*, in Truth and real Fact, is not *baptized* by *Him* that undertakes to perform that Office on him; but, in great Part, if not principally, *baptizes himself*—

Such Matter of endless Doubts, and unprofitable Disputes, does a *circumstantial exactness* as to their mere rite of Religion gender—But, we have not so learned **CHRIST.** We proceed

F

S E C T<sub>3</sub>

\* Vid. *Walker's Doctrine of Baptisms*, Ch. xv. § 15. *Vossius de Baptis. Disp. 1. Thes. 6.* See also a sad accident which befell a Company of Women in these Circumstances, in the great Church of Constantinople. *Bower's Hist. Popes* Vol. ii.

## SECTION II.

*Should Immersion be allowed to have been the only antient, apostolic and scriptural Mode of Baptizing; yet a strict Adherence to it is not obligatory on us: But this Circumstance may very lawfully and fitly be exchanged, for that of Sprinkling or Pouring.*

**T**O be satisfied of this, we need but consider — What is the true *Spirit* and *Design* of CHRISTIANITY: which the Apostle calls, a *Law of Liberty*: *James i. 25.* That a great part of it's Intention was, to take off Men's Regard from Things *ritual*, and *ceremonial*. It is a *Doctrine according to Godliness*; a spiritual, exalted, heavenly Scheme of Worship; in which the FATHER seeks such to worship him, as will do it *in Spirit and in Truth\**. It expressly declares that the Kingdom of GOD †, (or the State of Religion under the MESSIAH) *is not Meat and Drink*; i. e. stands not in Things ceremonial and ritual; *but in Righteousness, Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghost*; And, *He that in THESE serveth CHRIST, is acceptable to GOD, and approved of Men*. And, *in CHRIST JESUS, (or under the Christian Dispensation) neither Circumcision availeth any Thing, nor Uncircumcision, but a new Creature ‡.* To imagine, therefore, that our LORD intended *absolutely* and *immutably*, to bind down his Followers, of all Nations, and of all Ages, to the JEWISH Form of Baptizing; supposing it to have been by *Dipping only*; is quite repugnant to that *mild*, that *generous* and *free* Spirit which his Religion every where breathes—And here it is natural to observe

i. That

\* *John iv. 23.* † *Rom. xiv. 17.* ‡ *Galat. vi. 15.*

1. That concerning a certain ceremonial, emblematical Washing, much like this of christian Baptism, our divine Lawgiver hath determined—“ That the quantity of Water, or it’s application to the whole Body is little to be regarded.” Peter \* saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my Feet. JESUS answered him, if I wash thee not, thou hast no Part with me. Simon Peter saith unto him, LORD, not my Feet only but my Hands and my Head. JESUS saith unto him, he that is washed (in such an emblematical, figurative washing, as I am now going to perform) needeth not save to wash his Feet—The application of Water to one Part only, is as effectual to his cleansing, as if his whole Body was actually overwhelmed.

NOTE, The *Washing*, concerning which our Lord has left this Determination, was of the very same Nature with *Baptism*: i.e. It was an application of Water to the Body, for a *religious* or *moral* End. And this Determination, was, no doubt, left upon Record, that it might be applied by us (as, in the reason of the Thing, it is most justly applicable) under his *spiritual* Dispensation, to every like ceremonial Washing. And it evidently teaches us, that in such *ritual Purifications*, the quantity of Water and the manner of it’s Application, are Things of no great Concernment; upon which no important interest is to be laid in his Church. It is farther to be observed

2. That even under the *JEWISH*, which was confessedly a *weak* and *ceremonial* Dispensation, and which laid infinitely more Weight upon *ritual Observances* than the *CHRISTIAN RELIGION* does, a *Liberty* was given to human Prudence to dispense with some of the most *express* and most *solemn* Institutions, in Cases where only *Mercy* or *great Convenience* required it.

\* John xiii. 8, 9, 10.

Thus the *Rite of Circumcision*, though enjoined under the awful Penalty to the neglecter of *being cut off*\*, was yet, without Offence, *laid aside* for the space of *forty Years* †: And upon no other Ground as far as appears, but because the frequent and uncertain Decampments, Marches and Wars of the *Israelites*, in their passage through the Wilderness, rendered it *inconvenient* and *troublesome* to be observed.

So, by an *express Command* ‡, none but the *Priests were to eat of the hallowed or Shew Bread*: Yet *David* and his Men, when no other Supply could conveniently be had, violated this Injunction: They *eat of that Bread*, which it was **NOT LAWFUL** for *them to eat*, and are justified by **CHRIST** ||.

So also, the *brazen Serpent*, which was set up by the Command of **GOD**; honoured by many great and miraculous Cures; and designed, probably to be an instructive *Memorial* to future Ages (which is the very nature of a *Rite or Sacrament* in the Christian Church) was yet, when abused to Superstition, broken down by *Hezekiah* and actually destroyed §.

Now, if under the *Jewish*, ceremonial and weakly Dispensation, such *Liberty* was indulged to human Prudence and Convenience, as to *dispense with* and *set aside* its ritual Injunctions; and this, when they were enjoined under so *awful* and *severe* a Penalty; how absurd is it to imagine, that our divine Lawgiver **JESUS CHRIST** has, under his infinitely more free and *spiritual* Dispensation (under which *our State* is as much freer than that of the *Jews*, as the state of *Sons* is than that of *Servants*; or of *Friends*, than that of *Slaves*) tied us up to a strict and invariable exactness, as to merely *ritual Observances*; and that no considerations of Decency, Health, Convenience, or Mercy, ought now to sub-

\* Gen. xvii. 14.    † Josh. v. 5.    ‡ Levit. xxiv. 5 — 9.  
|| Matt. xiii. 4.    § Numb. xxi. 8, 9.    2 Kings xviii. 4.

substitute the Form of Sprinkling the baptismal Water, instead of a total Immersion into it? But, farther,

3. Many Rites of undoubted apostolical Usage if not Injunction, are now, without Blame, not only altered, but entirely laid aside. Which is a far greater Liberty, than the mere Substitution of Sprinkling instead of Dipping.

THE Greeting one another with the holy Kiss, was unquestionably an APOSTOLIC Practice. See Rom. xvi. 16. 1 Cor. xvi. 20. 2 Cor. xiii. 12. 1 Thess. v. 26. 1 Pet. v. 14. In all which Places it is expressly recommended, if not enjoined. Αλληλες φιλημεθε ασπαζομεθα παυσαμενοι ταν ευχαντα. Having finished our Prayers, we salute each other with a Kiss: Says Justin Martyr \*. A like APOSTOLIC Practice and Command was The anointing the Sick with Oyl, in the Name of the Lord. See Mark vi. 13. and Jam. v. 14.

Now to our good Brethren, who declaim zealously upon—Fulfilling all Righteousness—and who ask—“ By what Authority do you take upon you “ to alter CHRIST’s Institution; and laying aside “ the scriptural and apostolic Mode of Immersion, “ to substitute Sprinkling or Pouring in it’s Room?...” With great assurance we reply—“ By the very “ same, Sirs, by which you also quite abolish and “ lay aside the Scriptural, APOSTOLIC, Institution “ or Practice of saluting with the holy Kiss, and of “ Anointing the Sick with Oyl in the Name of the “ Lord.”—These we can prove, with ten times clearer Evidence, to have been either actually commanded, or practised, by the Apostles, than you can Baptism by Immersion only. Now, if these significant and holy Rites, unquestionably once enjoined, or practised, by the Apostles, in conformity to the common Usage of their Countries and Times, are by You wholly lay aside; because they would seem odd in this Country and Age where no such Customs obtain;

tain; we demand, Why *Bathing the whole Body* (which was also among the *Eastern Nations* and warm Climates, where Christianity was first planted, a very familiar and delightful Thing) Why, I say, may it not, in like manner be exchanged, for *Pouring Water* on the Body: Seeing such total *Immersions* are in this Country and Age, an *unusual*, a *troublesome*, a scarcely modest and decent, and in many Cases a cruel and a very dangerous Thing? — Especially, as the Form of *Pouring* is every whit as *Significative* as that of *Dipping* can be—Let those, who contend warmly for a *circumstantial* adherence to Scripture Practice in *one Rite*, say, how it is they justify the great *Liberty* they take quite to *abolish* and *change* others\*.

Again, Why do they not insist also, that *UNLEAVENED BREAD* and but *ONE LOAF*, ought constantly to be used in the Sacred Rite of *the Supper*? (To which, perhaps, may be added, The mixing *Water* with *Wine* in the Sacramental Cup) It is incomparably more certain that *these* only were used by our *Lord* and *his Apostles*, in *that* Sacrament; than that they *invariably* practised *Immersion only*, in the other.

It was *unleavened Bread* which our *Lord* took and broke (for the *Jews* at that Time, by the express Command of *God*, were to have *no other* in their Houses†) when He instituted *the Supper*, and said—*Do THIS in remembrance of me:* And concerning which, it is said—*As oft as ye eat THIS BREAD—What Bread was that?* *Bread* that was *unleavened*. Yea, and both these Circumstances, *viz.* The *Bread being unleavened*, and the having but *one Loaf*, are as expressly

\* Though a *Kiss of Peace*, and an Order of *Deaconesses*, were the Practices of the *Apostolic Time*; Yet when the one gave occasion to Raillery, and the other to Scandal, all the World was, and still is, satisfied with the Reasons of letting both fall. *Bishop Burnet on Art. xx.*

† *Exod. xiii. 7.*

expressly alluded to by the Apostle, and represented as significative of something moral in this Sacrament, as *Immersion* is of being buried with Christ, in the other. By the former, the unleavened Bread, the Christian Worshippers are remembered, of the Purity and Sincerity with which they should assemble, and celebrate this religious Rite. Therefore let us keep the Feast; not with old Leaven, neither with the Leaven of Malice and Wickedness, but with the UNLEAVENED BREAD of Sincerity and Truth \*. Behold how emblematical and significative it is made! And by the latter, the one Loaf, the UNITY of the Church is, with great Beauty and Propriety, figuratively shewn forth, and the Communion in one Body, into which all Christians are received. For we being many, are ONE BREAD, and one Body; for we are all partakers of that ONE BREAD †. Or, as the passage ought to have been rendered, Because there is ONE Bread, or Loaf used in this sacred Ceremony, we who are many are ONE Body; for we are all partakers of that ONE LOAF ‡.

LET some Reason be now shewn—Why we are to be tied down to a rigorous Conformity to the Circumstance of Dipping, in one Sacrament; but are not to the Circumstance of unleavened Bread, and of one Loaf, in the other? If we must indeed fulfil all Righteousness (as is warmly urged on this Head) if we must observe exactly ALL the Institutions and Rites of the apostolic Church; let us indeed, fulfil it. But then let us be consistent and uniform in our Obedience: Fulfilling the Righteousnes of saluting with the Holy Kiss—of anointing the Sick with Oyl in the name of the Lord—of unleavened Bread, and one Loaf in the Sacrament of the Supper; as well as the Righteousnes of Dipping the baptized. To conclude

#### 4. FROM

\* 1 Cor. v. 8. † 1 Cor. x. 17.

‡ Οὐτε εἰς Ἀγῶνα, εὐ σώμα τοῦ πολλοῦ εσμεν: οἱ γὰρ πάντες εἰς εὐσέ αὐτὸν μετεχόμενοι.

4. FROM our Lord's Decision in a like Case, viz. *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath; and I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*\*—It appears plainly to be his Will, not to tie up his Followers to a rigid and severe Exactness in Things of a ritual and positive kind.

THE Law injoining the *Sabbatical Rest*, was one of the TEN delivered, with infinite Pomp, at Mount Sinai—Is often spoken of as an important part of the Covenant which subsisted betwixt God and his People—Great *Blessings* are promised to it's religious Observation; and severe Threatenings denounced upon those who neglect it—Yea, a *Transgressor* was once, by the express Command of God, stoned to Death for it's violation, as a warning to future Ages—This is a thousand times more than can be said in support of the form of *Dipping in Baptism*: Yet behold! The strict observance of this *sabbatical Rest*, even under the Jewish, ceremonial, weakly Dispensation, was violated by the Apostles, and dispensed with by our LORD, when Convenience or *Compassion to the Body* required it. Much more, then, may we conclude, that the strict observance of *Dipping*, may be innocently neglected, under the infinitely more exalted Dispensation of CHRIST; when either *Decency*, or *Mercy*, or great *Convenience* forbids it's Use.

THIS Fact, viz. the Disciples breaking the *Sabbatical Rest*, by plucking and rubbing Ears of Corn, and our Lord's reasoning thereon, happened, no doubt, and was recorded with a view to the Instruction of after-ages; and was designed as a Precedent, a rule of Judgment and Action, by which we are to be directed in every like Case. Our Divine LEGISLATOR hath hereby taught us to reason thus—When the strict Observance of a merely *ritual Command* will be attended with Danger and great Inconvenience to the Disciples, it may lawfully be waved

\* Matt. xii. 7.      Mark ii. 27.

waved—Or thus : *Baptism was made for MAN ; and not MAN for Baptism.* If, therefore, through any change of national *Custom*, or of *Climate*, the form of *Dipping in Baptism* should become odd and unbecoming (as the *Love-Kiss* would now be) hazardous to the Health, or troublesome to the Disciples, it might then innocently be waved ; and a *Farmless* burthensome and disagreeable be substituted in it's Room.

AND here I beg leave to ask—Whether a strict Adherence to *Dipping the baptized*, would not, probably, be attended with as much *Danger* and *Inconvenience* to the Bodies of the *Disciples* now ; as a strict observance of *the sabbatical Rest* would have been to the twelve *Apostles*, when going through the Field of Corn ? In other Words—Whether it be not *as much Mercy* to excuse some at least (*viz.* new-born Infants, weakly and unhealthful Persons, and even all others throughout the *Winter Season*, in these *northern and cold Climates*) from being *totally plunged in Baptism* ; as it was to excuse the twelve from forbearing to pluck and rub the Corn on the *Sabbath Day*?

IT enters into the nature of Things *ritual* and *circumstantial*, to be mutable, transient and liable to be changed. As they are often but an *Adoption* of some *national Custom* (which is apparently the Case as to the Institution of *Baptism*) or, an *Accommodation* of a *common Usage* to some Purpose in *Religion*: So, they are *alterable* in their Nature ; and are themselves in some Measure to be *accommodated* to prevailing *Customs* and *Tastes* ; to the several *Countries*, *Climates*, and *Tempers* of Mankind. This, I apprehend, is the only Reasoning on which it is possible to justify our Disuse of the *primitive, apostolic Practice* of *saluting with a Kiss of Love*, in our worshipping Assemblies. The *Custom* of those antient Times rendered such *Salutations* neither odd nor *ridiculous*

42 Dipping, not the only scriptural

*culous*: But should the practice be introduced into our present Churches, and Worship; it needs not be said—with how just an offence!

Now, if, for NO OTHER REASON than a change of *national Custom*, we lay aside this undoubtedly *antient, apostolic*, religious Ceremony, the *Kiss of Charity*; Why should not a like change of *national Custom*, with regard to *Batbing the whole Body*, be allowed to justify it's Disuse in the Ceremony of *Baptism*? For a *Woman*, in thin Apparel, before a multitude of Spectators, to go into the Water, and be taken into the Arms of him who officiates, and be laid under the Water, is, in the present Nation and Age, an equally *indecent* and *disagreeable* Sight, as for Men, at the conclusion of public Prayers, to salute one another with a *Kiss of Charity* or *Peace*.

To conclude—If, after all that hath been said any still think it their indispensible Duty to baptize by *Immersion only*; let them, by all means, *thus baptize*; But then, we beseech them to forbear all severe Censures of those, who are *not Dipt.* Let them not represent us as persons *unbaptized*—withdraw from our Churches—refuse *Communion with us*, at the *common Table* of our *Lord*, upon so trifling a difference. This, surely, were to *disbanour* our sacred Religion; and too naturally brings not only *christian Baptism*, but *CHRISTIANITY* it self, into manifest *Contempt*.

Let us therefore, according to the apostolic Precept—*receive one another, but not to doubtful Disputations*. To maintain an *Unity of Spirit*, by mutual Forbearance, and to live together in perfect *Charity*, is a Matter of infinitely more Importance than the *Quantity* of Water, or the *Manner* of its Application, with which a Person is *baptized*. For the *Kingdom of God* is not *Meat and Drink*, but *Righteousness, and Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghost*. And

and primitive manner of Baptizing. 43

*the End of the Commandment is CHARITY; out of  
a pure Heart, and of a good Conscience, and of Faith  
unfeigned.*

Now the GOD of Patience and Consolation grant  
us to be like minded one towards another,  
according to *Christ Jesus*. That we may with  
one Mind, and one Mouth glorify GOD, even  
the Father of our *Lord Jesus Christ*. Amen.

F I N I S.



*Published by the same AUTHOR.*

*of a new edition, with a new Title, and a new Body of Substances  
and Arguments, to prove THE true MANNER  
of Baptizing Infants, and the right*

# BAPTISM

OF

## INFANTS,

A



### Reasonable Service;

*Founded upon SCRIPTURE, and undoubted  
APOSTOLIC TRADITION:*

In which

*It's Moral Purposes and Use in Religion are shewn.*

*Printed for J. Waugh, at the Turk's-Head, Lombard-Street.*

